

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 11, 13, and 25 through 30 are pending, with Claims 1, 13, 28, and 30 being independent. Claims 12 and 14 through 24 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 13 have been amended. Claims 26 through 30 have been added.

Transmitted herewith is one replacement sheet of formal drawings comprising Fig. 18 to be substituted for the corresponding drawing sheet presently on file. The new formal drawing attends to a formal matter by changing "PAY" to --RAY--. Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) on the grounds that the "3D image reproducer" and "area indicator board" recited in the claims are not depicted in the drawings. This objection is respectfully traversed, and is submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the claims to change "3D image reproducer" to --3D display apparatus-- (which Applicants submit to be depicted, e.g., in Figs. 13 through 15) and to change "area indicator board" to --area board-- (which Applicants respectfully submit to be depicted, e.g., in Fig. 11, item 4). Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 17, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and is submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the claims to change "area indicator board" to --area board--, and to change "shot together" to --imaged together--. In this regard, Applicants respectfully note that the specification explains at p.

14, line 8 et seq. and p. 15, line 1 et seq. that the area board 4 is shot (i.e., imaged) together with the object 2, and then by clipping the area that corresponds to the area board 4 out of the acquired image, only the image information in the area of existence of the mission points can be obtained, i.e., the “board” (either physical or virtual) has a size equivalent to the area of existence of the emission points and thus defines an area to be clipped.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that one having ordinary skill in the art could readily make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation, and that there has been no showing in the Official Action of any evidence or reasons to the contrary.

MPEP 2164.04.

Claims 5 through 8, 12, 17 through 20, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and is submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the claims in a manner earnestly believed to avoid the grounds of rejection (e.g., antecedent basis is present for each objected-to term (Claim 1 recites “an object” and Claim 2 recites “an imaging system), and “virtually” has been changed to --virtually in a virtual space constructed on a computer”, which Applicants submit to be clear in view of the specification at page 15, lines 5 and 6, and inasmuch as breadth does not constitute indefiniteness (MPEP 2173.04)).

Claims 1 through 25 were variously rejected under 35.U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,023,277 (Osaka, et al.). Claims 7, 8, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35.U.S.C. § 103 over Osaka et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,650 B1 (Ishikawa, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 13, and 28 variously recite, inter alia, generating 3D image reproduction data using a plurality of parallax images, the data being for a 3D display

apparatus that forms intersections of a plurality of rays in the air to generate a 3D image of an object.

Claim 30 recites, inter alia, a display panel comprising a plurality of light sources for emitting a plurality of rays, with associating coordinates of the light sources with coordinates of pixels in the parallax images, and emitting a ray of the determined color and intensity from each light source to the direction of the viewpoints.


However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Osaka, et al. nor Ishikawa, et al., even in the proposed combination, assuming, arguendo, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed combinations of claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 1, 13, 28, and 30. It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Attorney for Applicants  
Daniel S. Glueck  
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DSG/dc

DC\_MAIN 159890v1